

Appn No. 09/610,095
Arndt Dated August 09, 2004
Response to Office action of June 14, 2004

2

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims

The Examiner rejected claims 1-5 and 7-9. No amendments have been made to the claims therefore claim 1-5 and 7-9 remain pending in the application.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §103(a)

Claims 1-5 and 7-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wolff et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,081,261) in view of Montlick (U.S. Patent No. 5,561,446). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

As argued previously, Wolff et al. incorporate “signature verification”, described at col. 2, lines 57-61, in an electronic document handling and processing system by interpreting time, location and pressure parameters of a “pen-like instrument”. While that is a sophisticated method of verifying a signature, it has little in common with the method of registering specific sensing devices with respective users as defined in amended claim 1 of the present application. The Examiner has acknowledged that Wolff et al do not teach the limitations of claim 1 of “*storing, in the computer system, first registration data associating an identity of the first registered user with the identity of the unregistered sensing device.*”

However, the Examiner provided a new ground of rejection and asserted “Montlick teaches storing, in the computer system, first registration data associating an identity of the first registered user with the identity of the unregistered sensing device (col. 3, lines 6-13), and storing, in the computer system, second registration data associating an identity of a second registered user with the identity of the registered sensing device (fig. 1, ref. Num 12, 14, and 16).”

The Applicants respectfully submit that Montlick does not teach or suggest the above limitations of the present claim 1. Rather, Montlick appears to teach away from the above limitations of claim 1. Montlick at col. 3, lines 6-13 discloses only that handwritten data on a form entered through a pen-based computer as “electronic ink” can be associated with other data which in turn can be associated with still other data stored in a central computer system. Further, Montlick at Fig. 1, ref. numerals 12, 14 and 16 discloses only “a plurality of portable pen-based computers 12, 14, 16” (col. 4, lines 60-61) in communication with a central computer system (10). Montlick does not teach associating an identity of a first registered user with the identity of an unregistered sensing device.

Appn No. 09/610,095
 Amdt. Dated August 09, 2004
 Response to Office action of June 14, 2004

3

Montlick appears to teach away from the limitations of the present claims because Montlick implies that any of the portable pen-based computers 12, 14, 16 may be used, for example, by a doctor in a hospital to enter diagnosis data about a particular patient. Thus there is no association of a particular doctor with a particular computer, as would be required to establish an analogy with the present claims. Montlick at col. 9, lines 47-50 states: "Those skilled in the art will appreciate that the doctor's name is made known to the computer when the doctor first activates the pen-based computer 12 and is required to enter an access key and/or password." Thus Montlick teaches identifying a particular doctor with particular "digital ink" only through a conventional "access key and/or password" system. The present invention is designed to make just such "access key and/or password" systems unnecessary, by establishing secure registration data that associates a particular registered user with a particular sensing device. Thus once such association is accomplished, the netpage system of the present invention may automatically associate all actions of a particular sensing device with the registered user of that sensing device--without the need for additional "access key and/or password" authorizations. For example, that feature of the present claims is described in the present specification as originally filed at page 46, line 26, to page 47, line 1, where the sensing device of claim 1 is referred to as a "netpage pen": *In order to utilize the netpage system a person must first become a netpage registered user. In the preferred implementation of the present invention, a user must be registered with the netpage network, own or be associated with at least one registered netpage pen, and be authorized on at least one netpage printer, before being able to meaningfully interact with the netpage network.*"

The Applicants believe that the other rejections to the dependent claims in view of Wolff et al. and Montlick are also unsupported based on the above arguments concerning Montlick and the Applicants' previous arguments concerning Wolff et al.

The Applicants therefore respectfully submit that the application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of the application is courteously solicited.

Very respectfully,

Applicant:

Paul Lapstun

PAUL LAPSTUN

Kia Silverbrook

KIA SILVERBROOK

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd
 393 Darling Street
 Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com
 Telephone: +612 9818 6633
 Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762